

million. In addition, PBS received \$4 million more than other Federal agencies.

Public TV stations are a 501(c)(3) nonprofit group, and as such, they are tax exempt. Being tax exempt, they are prohibited from supporting any political party or engaging in any lobbying or other partisan activity.

I serve on the Committee on Commerce's Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection last week, during consideration of the reauthorization of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, a story came to light about a Boston public TV station which had shared 32,000 names with the Democrat National Committee. It reported that Sam Black, a 4-year-old received a fund-raising letter from the DNC.

□ 1245

It appears that Sam's mother included his name with her own when she sent a donation to the Boston station WGBH. The first time this fund-raising exchange was reported, the station originally maintained that it was an isolated incident, a mistake by an ill-informed employee. Of course, the facts, Mr. Speaker, showed differently.

WGBH first approached the Democratic Party in 1993. In that first year, the station received 5,000 names of Democratic campaign donors. The next year WGBH, in a sense, paid for new names by swapping the names of their contributors.

The station also received a financial payment for providing 10,200 names. My colleagues and I on the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection wanted to know more; specifically, if this practice was widespread or if there was just one station involved. We found, of course, that their stations in San Francisco, Los Angeles, New York, and even here in the Washington, D.C. area that had been cooperating with the DNC in fund-raising activities for as long as 20 years.

I am not concerned that the Republicans were excluded from this fund-raising effort. I am concerned that tax-exempt organizations are engaging in partisan politics. Since the beginning, there has been a close relationship between the Public Broadcasting Service and what many of us perceive as the liberal agenda. In the mid-1990s, the Media Research Center studied 73 PBS programs for political bias. It found there was a liberal slant on these shows. Now, more recently, Mr. Speaker, PBS decided not to air the President's videotaped testimony before the grand jury or to offer live coverage of the impeachment debate in the House Judiciary. Instead, Mr. Speaker, it ran Barney and the Teletubbies. However, it did find it appropriate and in the public interest to provide full coverage for the Watergate and Iran-Contra hearings.

Now we have discovered that there is more than just an ideological connec-

tion between PBS and the Democratic Party. This financial cooperation is clearly in violation of our tax laws and could be of interest to the FEC and to the IRS.

During consideration of the reauthorization for CPB, I prepared an amendment calling on the comptroller of the United States to conduct a study, a simple study, on this swapping of donor lists and to report what stations, which political parties, and the circumstances of this cooperation. However, the hearing on reauthorization has been postponed, but Congress needs to act now.

The next step is for the GAO to launch an investigation into this matter. I also want to see the CPB take steps themselves to find out the extent of these joint fund-raising activities and to assure Congress and the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection that this has ended and will not occur again.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the American people now endure the highest level of taxation in this Nation's history. These hard-working people should not be sending their tax dollars to help support public TV stations which are working with the DNC to enrich their respective organizations. Public TV stations should be serving the public interest and, of course, not any partisan political interest.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

MOVING FORWARD IS BEST FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been struck by the change in the rhetoric from my Republican colleagues with regard to the work of the Congress, particularly the House of Representatives. For years, I have heard them talk about what they were going to accomplish beginning with the Contract with America that they trumpeted.

Now in the last couple of weeks, there is a new tone. Instead of telling us what they are going to do, they are explaining why they have been unable to do it. The Republicans are into a new phase in the Republican revolution, whining. They are complaining that while they wanted to do all of these things, they have been unable. What we now have, rather than an announcement of a program is an explanation for its failure.

I was particularly struck to note that they were blaming the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), in large part. I reread the Contract with America. One does not get to read only for pleasure in our work. Sometimes we must read as a duty, so I reread the Contract with America, and I did not find in there that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) was listed as a subcontractor.

I did not read in there that the Contract with America said here are these bold things we will do if the Democrats let us. But now what do we hear? The Democrats would not let me do it. It is a kind of a reverse Flip Wilson. It is no longer the devil made them do it. It is that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) would not let them do it.

Well, I should say in fairness, Mr. Speaker, that they have even been giving me a little bit of the credit. We are not a profession known for great modesty, but I am a little reluctant to accept quite as much credit for their failure as they give me. Clearly, it would be in my interest in many quarters to accept that credit without dissent but I do have to be honest and say they give me a little more credit than I deserve.

I want to say right now that when the Appropriations bills have come up, I have not worn my costume of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and held the bills up. That was not I. It was not the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT). That was a member of their own party.

It is not I who has decided, for instance, that term limits, and remember term limits? Some members do. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) does because he is an honest man who is abiding by his promise, but term limits was part of the Contract with America. Well, that contract apparently has been declared null and void because in this year we have the Republican Party in control of the House, and no one has brought up the term limits issue. It seems to have evanesced into the wind.

Now, as I said, they are arguing that it is the fault of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and myself. They are clearly wrong. They have been the majority. They are in their third Congress of a majority. They have the votes. They are, in fact, unable to do things for which I am glad, but they have misargued the cause. Their platform has not become law, not because of myself and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), much as I would love to take the credit, but because it is unpassable, and it is unpassable because it is unacceptable to the American people.

Their problem is that they won an election in 1994 based on dissatisfaction with the Democrats, acknowledgedly, and then proceeded to a program which included at one point shutting down the government, excessive tax cutting that even a few on their own side do